

William I. Cargo, of Maryland.  
John S. Graham, of North Carolina.  
Leland J. Haworth, of New York.

### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 11, 1961:

#### CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Arthur H. Frye, Jr., Corps of Engineers, to be president and senior member of the

California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507; 35 U.S.C. 661).

#### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

Harold C. Woodworth to be senior surgeon.  
Winsor V. Morrison to be senior assistant surgeon.

Morris L. Shoss to be senior sanitary engineer.

James H. Eagen to be assistant sanitary engineer.

Gerald R. Stowe to be assistant pharmacist.

Trygve O. Berge to be scientist director.  
U.S. Grant III to be senior veterinary officer.

Mildred Kaufman to be dietitian.  
Lamont B. Smith to be senior assistant therapist.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Farm Legislation in the 87th Congress, 1st Session

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 87th Congress is drawing to a close, and it is my duty, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to review for the Members of the House the work of this Congress, thus far, in behalf of agriculture.

This report is a matter of great pride for me, and I am sure the majority of the Members of this body feel the same deep satisfaction in what is accomplished.

This 87th Congress, which convened in January, already has done more to change and improve the fortunes of the farm families of America than perhaps any Congress since the enactment of the basic agricultural laws that were designed to lift agriculture out of the great depression.

We have moved effectively to ease the cost-price squeeze that for almost a decade has strangled the farm economy. We have reversed the long downward trend in farm income. The effects of our work already are evident. During the month ended August 15, the index of prices received by farmers rose nearly 2 percent. The mid-August index was 3 percent above a year earlier.

This is being achieved because we have an administration and the Congress working together, with common objectives.

When this Congress convened in January, the time was nearing when farmers would plant their crops. A new administration was coming into power. Time was of the essence, if we were to come to grips in 1961 with the deepening depression that had settled upon the farmlands of our Nation. The situation demanded courageous and swift action.

The most pressing problem of agriculture confronting us was the great and burdensome surplus of wheat and feed grains, and the prospect that crops to be planted this year would build this surplus to more costly and staggering proportions.

The new administration, after Orville Freeman had been named the Secretary

of Agriculture, and after he had consulted with farm legislators in the Congress, came forward with a proposal that offered the one great promise of injecting stability in a large area of agriculture in 1961. This was the feed grains bill.

This bill proposed to establish a one-year emergency program to reduce the production of feed grains in 1961, and thereby to alleviate the conditions of oversupply and low prices then seriously depressing a major segment of the Nation's agriculture and placing on taxpayers the burden of holding nearly \$4 billion of these grains.

Our Committee on Agriculture called this legislation up for consideration against a background of almost a decade of national controversy and bickering on farm policy, during which time the farm economy had gradually deteriorated. The basic issue in this background was between those who would remove restraints upon an already exploding production and those who contended that the only way for agriculture to achieve a fair price structure is to adjust production to the needs of the markets. Our Committee on Agriculture, with remarkable speed, resolved the issue in a determination to make the law of supply and demand work for the farmer, and not against him. We reported the legislation to provide incentives for farmers to reduce their production of feed grains. The Congress promptly passed the bill, and it was signed into law by the President.

Farmers responded magnificently. They cooperated in the new program far beyond expectations. Consequently, feed grains production has been brought into reasonable bounds in 1961, to the great benefit of farmers and taxpayers as well.

Mr. Speaker, the program is expected to add around \$750 million, in 1961, as compared with 1960, to the income of corn, grain sorghum, oats, barley and soybean producers.

This 1961 feed grain program has worked, as follows:

First. Payment in cash or in kind for retiring 20 percent of corn and grain sorghum acreage—or up to 20 acres, whichever is greater on individual farms. Eligibility for price support for corn and grain sorghum to be contingent upon participation in this diversion of 20 percent of acreage or 20 acres.

Second. Payment in kind for retiring an additional 20 percent of corn and

grain sorghum acreage. However, this additional acreage diversion would not be required as a condition for price support eligibility.

Third. An increase in the price support level for corn from \$1.06 to \$1.20 a bushel, and increases in the supports for grain sorghums and other feed grains. Also, an increase in the support level of soybeans, intended to divert at least 2 million acres from corn and grain sorghums.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture, with the feed grains program underway early in the spring, turned forthwith to work upon general farm legislation, to be effective with the 1962 crops.

I want to commend the members of our committee and the Members of the House, regardless of political party affiliations, who worked so long, so hard, and with such dedication, to reverse the long, desperate, downward trend in farm prices which had depressed the farm economy and impoverished large areas of agriculture. I am especially encouraged at the substantial support many Members representing city constituencies gave to this effort to stabilize the farm economy.

Agriculture is by far the Nation's largest industry. Farming employs more persons than the steel industry, automobile industry, transportation industry, and public utilities combined. This 87th Congress has demonstrated a sound awareness that what happens in agriculture bears directly not only upon farmers but ultimately upon consumers, taxpayers, and the economy as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the great range of clashing views abroad in this country on the direction farm policy should take, this Congress proceeded with the job that had to be done. We passed, and the President has signed, the Agricultural Act of 1961. I think it is the most important piece of legislation, in the interest of farmers, to be enacted in a decade.

Following are the major provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1961:

#### DECLARATION OF POLICY

The act makes a broad declaration in behalf of policies in order more fully and effectively to improve, maintain, and protect the prices and incomes of farmers, to enlarge rural purchasing power, to achieve a better balance between supplies of agricultural commodities and the requirements of consumers therefor, to preserve and strengthen the structure of agriculture, and

to revitalize and stabilize the overall economy at reasonable costs to the Government. It specifically declares it to be the policy of the Congress to "recognize the importance of the family farm as an efficient unit of production and as an economic base for towns and cities in rural areas and encourage, promote, and strengthen this form of farm enterprise."

#### TITLE I—SUPPLY AND PRICE STABILIZATION

##### *Consultation on agricultural programs*

Provides authority for consultation and advising with farmers and farm and commodity organizations in developing agricultural programs.

##### *The 1962 wheat program*

1. A mandatory reduction of 10 percent in wheat acreage and incentives for producers to reduce their acreage voluntarily another 30 percent to a maximum 40-percent acreage curtailment on individual farms. A producer could retire up to 40 percent of his allotment or 10 acres, whichever is greater, and receive payment for such diversion.

2. An exemption from marketing quotas limited to 13.5 acres per farm or the highest acreage planted for harvest in 1959, 1960, or 1961. The present exemption is 15 acres.

3. Price support limited to producers who do not exceed their reduced 1962 acreage allotment and who divert an acreage at least equal to 10 percent of their previous acreage allotment to conservation uses, with payments in cash or in kind on up to 45 percent of normal production for such diversion.

Secretary Freeman has set the 1962 wheat support at a national average of \$2 a bushel. This is 83½ percent of parity. The support this year is \$1.79 or 75 percent of parity.

4. Payments in cash or in kind up to 60 percent on normal production on wheat acres voluntarily removed from production above the mandatory 10-percent diversion.

5. Authority for producers to plant castor beans, guar, sunflower, safflower, or sesame, if designated by the Secretary, subject to the conditions that no payment shall be made with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such commodity.

6. Increases the marketing penalty from 45 to 65 percent of parity price and establishes stricter computation of amount subject to penalty, in cases of noncompliance with allotments.

7. Provides that where producers can prove their 1959 and 1960 acreages and yields, these figures shall be accepted.

8. Authority for 3 years, beginning with 1962, for the Secretary to increase Durum wheat acreage allotments if the supply warrants. No export subsidies on Durum if acreage is increased.

##### *The 1962 feed grains program*

1. A voluntary retirement of acreage previously devoted to corn, grain sorghum, and barley. The 1962 program would add barley to the grain program in operation for corn and grain sorghum in 1961. A special exemption is provided for producers of malting barley.

2. Payments to producers on retired acreage up to 50 percent of the normal value of production on these acres, at the current support rate, for the first 20 percent of the corn, grain sorghum, and barley acres retired to a conservation use, and payment up to 60 percent of the normal value of production on land retired above 20 percent of the previous acreage in these crops. Any producer may place a minimum of 20 acres of cropland in conservation use and receive payments.

3. A price support level determined at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, but not less than 65 percent of parity. Under similar provision in the 1961 program the Secretary set the support of corn at \$1.20 a bushel, or 74 percent of parity, and grain

sorghum at \$1.93 a hundredweight, or 78 percent of parity. The corn support in 1960 was \$1.06 and grain sorghum \$1.52.

4. As a condition of eligibility for price support a producer of corn, grain sorghum or barley (except as provided for malting barley) must participate in the acreage reduction program for these crops in 1962, to the extent prescribed by the Secretary. To be in compliance with the program, a producer of corn or grain must not increase his acreage of barley and a producer of barley must not increase his acreage of corn or grain sorghum.

##### *Marketing orders*

1. Adds to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, peanuts by areas of production, turkeys and turkey hatching eggs, cherries and cranberries for canning or freezing; and also adds apples, both fresh and for canning and freezing (and products except canned or frozen products are covered) in Michigan, New York, New England, Maryland, New Jersey, Indiana, and California. The provision relating to peanuts requires that if any orders are developed for peanuts, each of such orders shall be limited to peanuts produced in one of the areas named in the bill. Tobacco would remain in the list of commodities where producers, if they wish, could develop marketing orders. Soybeans are deleted from this list.

2. Requires processors representing over 50 percent of the volume of cranberries, cherries, and apples for canning or freezing to approve any marketing order, as well as producers, before it can become effective.

3. Also includes provisions: (a) amending the above-parity provision of the act to prevent termination of orders prior to the end of the marketing season; (b) changing the civil penalty provision to aid enforcement by reducing the penalty and dropping "willful"; (c) permitting orders for groups or portions of commodities; (d) requiring referendums for initial orders and that the ballot describe the order; and (e) providing for processor referendums in cases where processor approval is required.

4. Adds to the commodities subject to import regulation under section 8e, when marketing orders are in effect on the same commodities in the United States, oranges, onions, walnuts, and dates except dates for processing.

##### *Wool*

Extends the National Wool Act for 4 years to March 31, 1966.

#### TITLE II—EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 480—AGRICULTURE TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

1. Amends title I (sales of commodities for foreign currencies) of Public Law 480 to (a) extend title for 3 years; (b) establish a limitation of \$4.5 billion on disposal of surpluses under title I agreements for a 3-year period and an annual limit of \$2.5 billion; (c) authorize the use of foreign currencies for dollar sales to American tourists; (d) improve the agricultural market development activities in foreign nations by setting aside 5 percent of the foreign currencies acquired each year to this purpose and by requiring that not less than 2 percent of the foreign currency sales proceeds be convertible into the currencies of other foreign nations as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary to improve overall U.S. market development activities.

2. Amends title II (food donations to relieve distress among friendly peoples) to (a) extend title II for 3 years through December 31, 1964; (b) extend authority for economic development for 3 years through December 31, 1964; (c) continue present authorization of \$300 million per year, plus carryover; (d) make annual limitation applicable to amount programmed rather than amount spent.

#### TITLE III—AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

##### *1. Real estate loans:*

(a) To persons who are or will become owner-operators of not larger than family farms.

(b) Available to all farm owners and tenants for soil and water conservation measures.

(c) May be made to certain nonprofit associations for soil and water conservation, drainage, and flood control, with an insured loan limit of \$1 million and a direct loan limit of \$500,000.

(d) Sets the limit on loans to individuals for land acquisition at \$60,000.

(e) Both insured and direct loans may be made up to 100 percent of normal value of the farm.

(f) Provides interest rate of not to exceed 5 percent plus fees. Out of 5 percent paid by insured loan borrowers, one-half of 1 percent to go to insurance fund and one-half of 1 percent now used for administrative expenses could go to the lender as additional interest.

(g) In determining eligibility for real estate loans the Secretary must consider prevailing private and cooperative interest rates in the community and must determine that the applicant is a U.S. citizen, has farm background and either training or experience, and is or will become a family farm owner-operator.

##### *2. Operating loans:*

(a) Increases loan limit from \$20,000 to \$35,000, and limits term of loan to 7 years. Not more than 25 percent of the annual appropriation can be used to create borrower indebtedness in excess of \$15,000.

(b) Authorizes participation loans up to 80 percent with private lenders.

(c) Provides interest rate of not to exceed 5 percent.

(d) Authorizes loans to soil conservation districts which are unable to obtain necessary credit elsewhere on reasonable terms and conditions, to purchase farm equipment customarily used for soil conservation purposes. Single loans are limited to \$35,000 outstanding indebtedness and total loans cannot exceed \$500,000 in any 1 year.

(e) In determining eligibility for operating loans the Secretary must consider prevailing interest rates in the local community and must determine that the applicant is a U.S. citizen, has farm background and either training or experience and is or will become a family farm owner-operator.

##### *3. Emergency loans:*

(a) Authorized in areas suffering from natural disaster conditions.

(b) Provides interest rate of not to exceed 3 percent under terms applicable to regular real estate or operating loans.

(c) In determining eligibility for emergency loans the Secretary must consider any established farmer or rancher or citizen of the United States or a private domestic corporation or partnership engaged primarily in farming or ranching in designated areas with experience and resources sufficient for probable successful operation, and persons or corporations outside designated areas who have suffered severe production losses not general to the area.

#### TITLE IV—GENERAL

1. Extension of Great Plains conservation program to December 31, 1971.

2. Extension of the school milk program for 5 years through June 30, 1967, with the House provision requiring annual appropriations.

3. Extension of the veterans and Armed Forces dairy programs for 3 years through December 31, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Act of 1961 and the earlier special feed grains bill are the major enactments of the



87th Congress thus far, in behalf of agriculture. But along with this work we have developed and enacted other important legislation relating to the well-being of agriculture, thus contributing to the strength of the general economy.

Of particular importance was the bill to extend and amend the Sugar Act.

In July 1960, Congress enacted Public Law 86-592, which, first, extended the Sugar Act for 3 months—from December 31, 1960, to March 31, 1961—second, authorized the President to set the Cuban sugar quota for the balance of the calendar year 1960 and for the first 3 months of 1961 at any level not in excess of the Cuban quota under the basic quota system of the Sugar Act, and, third, directed the manner in which replacement supplies of sugar were to be obtained upon reduction of the Cuban quota.

Under this authority the Cuban quota has been cut to zero.

The sugar bill we enacted this year extended the Sugar Act from March 31, 1961, to June 30, 1962. It did not change the basic provisions of the act, although the legislation embraced two amendments to the emergency authority: First, to relieve the President of the obligation to purchase any part of the sugar formerly supplied by Cuba from any country with which the United States does not maintain diplomatic relations; and second, to require that in above-quota foreign purchases consideration should be given to countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

The necessity of passing the bill before the Sugar Act expired on March 31 this year, and the complicated nature of the Sugar Act, which finds all of its provisions interrelated and dependent upon each other, made it impossible for the committee to take action on several propositions which would have made substantial changes in the basic act.

It was the committee's intention, upon completing work on the Agricultural Act of 1961, to return to sugar problems and hold the necessary hearings and conduct the essential studies to enact long-term sugar legislation, dealing with quota adjustments for foreign supplies and with the desire for expansion of domestic sugar production in old and new areas. We were awaiting recommendations from the Department of Agriculture, which administers the sugar program.

On August 3, I received a letter from Secretary Freeman advising that for several reasons it appeared inadvisable for the Department to present recommendations for amending and extending the Sugar Act before the beginning of the next session of Congress. He said "world production and marketing of sugar are undergoing realignment and the situation has not yet stabilized," and this fact, coupled with other uncertainties in the international fields "lead us to believe it wise to reserve judgment for the present about some of the major issues respecting sugar import quotas." Moreover, the Secretary said "within the domestic sugar industry there are also important unresolved issues."

I subsequently announced that no further sugar legislation would be con-

sidered at this session but that such legislation will be given preferred treatment when the Congress returns in January. But, ever alert to the problems relating to sugar, internationally and among our own producers, our committee on September 7 adopted resolutions:

First. That the President be requested to instruct those in charge of administering the sugar program that it is the clear intent of Congress that in making any foreign purchases of sugar for the calendar year 1962 clear preference is to be given those countries which offer to buy a reasonable quantity of U.S. agricultural commodities in return for our purchase of their sugar.

Second. That it is the sense of the committee that in allocating the sugar tonnage necessary to supply the domestic growth factor, the Secretary of Agriculture should make allocations to new mills so that this new tonnage can support the development of the sugar industry in new areas in anticipation of passage of legislation revising the Sugar Act in 1962.

Third. That the committee would regard with extreme disfavor any action or statement by any representative of the United States at the Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, on the International Sugar Agreement, which would commit the United States or imply, either directly or indirectly, any commitment on the part of the United States to adopt any system of sugar importation other than fixed statutory quotas such as have heretofore operated so effectively under the Sugar Act of 1948 and previous laws.

Mr. Speaker, the three major farm enactments I have discussed are Public Law 87-5—the special feed grains program for 1961; Public Law 87-15—amend and extend the Sugar Act; and Public Law 87-128—the Agricultural Act of 1961.

Our committee has considered and reported to the House many other bills in this session dealing with specific matters relating to agriculture. A number have become public law, including:

Public Law 87-8—Farmers Home Administration loans (ceiling increase).

Public Law 87-10—extend time for application of 1959 amendment to Federal Nematocide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act.

Public Law 87-28—amend title I of Public Law 480 (provides \$2 billion additional authority during 1961).

Public Law 87-33—temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments.

Public Law 87-37—cotton acreage allotments transfer from flooded areas.

Public Law 87-62—emergency hay harvesting on conservation reserve acreage in drought areas.

Public Law 87-67—special milk program for children, expanded and extended to June 30, 1962.

Public Law 87-104—wheat referendum time extension to August 26, 1961.

Public Law 87-106—emergency livestock loans extension.

Public Law 87-127—surplus grain sales in disaster areas.

As I make this report, several bills relating to agriculture are awaiting final action before we adjourn. Among these is the Mexican farm labor bill.

Mr. Speaker, in closing this report, let me emphasize again to my colleagues that the work we have done in this first session of the 87th Congress, particularly in the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1961 and the special feed grains program for 1961, will restore stability to large areas of agriculture. It will reduce burdensome farm surpluses. It will save taxpayers almost \$1 billion by diminishing expenditures on farm programs.

However, Mr. Speaker, we by no means have solved all of the problems of agriculture. Some commodities will not be helped by what we have done. They still will be in trouble when this session is adjourned.

In most of these commodities, effective action by the Congress must await the development of unity among producers on what kind of program they want.

The 2d session of the 87th Congress, which convenes next January, will write further general farm legislation. I am hopeful, and I am sure my colleagues here are hopeful, that leadership and unity among farmers themselves will develop in such a way that we may then be able to take another great stride to provide adequate rewards for the people of this country who have made us the best fed nation on the face of the earth.

#### Status of the Regular Appropriation Bills and Legislative Back-Door Appropriation Provisions, 87th Congress, 1st Session

##### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House and the country, I include up-to-date tabulations on the status of the regular appropriation bills and identified legislative bills carrying back-door provisions of one kind or another.

With presentation of the two conference reports today and the public works bill scheduled in the House tomorrow, we are near the conclusion of the regular appropriations schedule of the session. The usual last supplemental bill of the session will be reported tomorrow and disposed of this week. As disclosed by the tabulation, the District and foreign assistance bills are in the Senate. The State, Justice, judiciary bill is in conference and will be forthcoming.

The appropriations business has been delayed inordinately this session by the unexplained lateness of the growing practice of processing authorization bills annually. The Committee on Appropriations has been marking time for several weeks on certain bills waiting for the authorizations to clear.

The tables follow.

Table of appropriation bills, 87th Cong., 1st sess., as of Sept. 11, 1961

(Does not include any back-door appropriation bills)

Title	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed House	House action compared with budget estimates	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed Senate	Senate action compared with—		Final conference action	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date
						Budget estimates	House action		
1961 SUPPLEMENTALS									
3d supplemental.....	\$1,235,482,769	\$803,506,119	—\$431,976,650	\$5,275,213,127	\$4,637,419,970	—\$637,793,157	+\$3,833,913,851	\$1,694,055,637	—\$3,581,157,490
Inter-American program.....	600,000,000	600,000,000	-----	600,000,000	600,000,000	-----	-----	600,000,000	-----
4th supplemental.....	88,024,000	47,214,000	—40,810,000	88,024,000	47,214,000	—40,810,000	-----	47,214,000	—40,810,000
Total, 1961 supplementals.....	1,923,506,769	1,450,720,119	—472,786,650	5,963,237,127	5,284,633,970	—678,603,157	+\$3,833,913,851	2,341,269,637	—3,621,967,490
1962 APPROPRIATIONS									
Treasury-Post Office.....	5,371,801,000	5,281,865,000	—89,936,000	5,371,801,000	5,327,631,000	—44,170,000	+45,766,000	5,298,765,000	—73,036,000
Interior.....	782,387,000	753,319,000	—29,068,000	782,387,000	813,399,850	+31,012,850	+60,080,850	779,158,650	—3,228,350
Labor-HEW.....	4,282,148,081	4,327,457,000	+45,308,919	5,004,281,081	5,161,380,000	+157,098,919	+833,923,000	4,915,965,000	—88,316,081
Legislative.....	105,647,577	104,353,335	—1,294,242	136,082,802	135,432,065	—650,737	+31,078,730	135,432,065	—650,737
State, Justice, Judiciary.....	795,891,202	751,300,050	—44,591,152	795,891,202	762,038,550	—33,852,652	+10,738,500	762,038,550	—33,852,652
Agriculture.....	6,089,244,000	5,948,466,000	—140,778,000	6,089,244,000	5,967,457,500	—121,786,500	+18,991,500	5,967,494,500	—121,749,500
Loan authorizations.....	(612,000,000)	(629,900,000)	(+17,900,000)	(612,000,000)	(725,500,000)	(+113,500,000)	(+95,600,000)	(725,500,000)	(+113,500,000)
Independent offices.....	8,625,561,000	8,404,068,000	—221,493,000	9,174,561,000	9,098,769,500	—75,791,500	+694,671,500	8,966,285,000	—208,276,000
General Government—Commerce.....	666,278,000	626,958,000	—39,320,000	666,278,000	650,438,200	—15,839,800	+23,480,200	641,135,800	—25,142,200
Defense.....	42,942,345,000	42,711,105,000	—231,240,000	46,396,945,000	46,848,292,000	+451,347,000	+4,137,187,000	46,662,556,000	+266,611,000
District of Columbia.....	(292,438,188)	(268,122,400)	(+24,315,788)	(292,438,188)	(268,122,400)	(+24,315,788)	-----	(268,122,400)	(+24,315,788)
Loan authorization.....	(24,600,000)	(29,000,000)	(+4,400,000)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Federal payment.....	39,753,000	32,753,000	—7,000,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Military construction.....	1,047,568,000	883,359,000	—164,209,000	1,047,568,000	1,020,146,750	—27,421,250	+136,787,750	947,878,750	—99,689,250
Foreign assistance.....	4,959,991,000	3,835,245,000	—1,124,746,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Public works.....	3,732,038,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Supplemental.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, 1962 appropriations.....	79,474,652,860	73,660,278,385	—5,814,374,475	75,465,039,085	75,784,985,415	+319,946,330	+5,992,705,030	74,314,670,765	—354,477,118
Total, all appropriations.....	81,398,159,629	75,110,998,504	2,555,123,125	81,428,276,212	81,069,619,385	—358,656,827	+9,826,618,881	76,655,940,402	—3,976,444,608
Total, loan authorizations.....	(636,600,000)	(688,900,000)	(+52,300,000)	(612,000,000)	(725,500,000)	(+113,500,000)	(+95,600,000)	(725,500,000)	(+113,500,000)

<sup>1</sup> Major reductions include 2 items submitted directly to Senate (S. Doc. 19): (1) \$2,969,625,000 to restore funds of Commodity Credit Corporation. Entire estimate disallowed in conference; \$1,951,915,000 resubmitted for 1962 in budget estimates for Agriculture (H. Doc. 155); (2) \$490,000,000 for "Payment to the Federal extended compensation account." Reduction made by Senate. Resubmitted to Senate for 1962 in Labor-HEW bill (S. Doc. 30).

<sup>2</sup> Includes borrowing authority as follows: Budget estimate, \$15,000,000; House reported and passed, \$10,000,000; Senate reported and passed, \$10,000,000.

<sup>3</sup> Pending final disposition in House, with \$3,812,000 not settled (and not included in this figure).

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations are included in this table.

New authority to obligate the Government carried in identified legislative bills—1st sess., 87th Cong. (public debt borrowing, contract authority, use of receipts, and authority to use existing authority)

(Please note that for some bills no amounts are shown; thus the grand totals understate the situation)

Bill and subject	Executive requests		Senate	House	Enacted	Enacted compared with executive requests—	
	Full basis	Basis comparable to enacted				Full basis	Comparable basis
1. Veterans' direct loans, multiyear (H.R. 5723; Public Law 87-84) (public debt).....	(1)	(1)	\$1,050,000,000	\$1,050,000,000	\$1,050,000,000	+\$1,050,000,000	+\$1,050,000,000
2. Area redevelopment, multiyear (S. 1; Public Law 87-27) (public debt).....	<sup>2</sup> (\$300,000,000)	<sup>2</sup> (\$300,000,000)	<sup>2</sup> 300,000,000	<sup>2</sup> (300,000,000)	<sup>2</sup> 300,000,000	+300,000,000	+300,000,000
3. Agricultural commodities, sales for foreign currencies, for calendar year 1961 (S. 1027; Public Law 87-28) (contract authority involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC).....	<sup>4</sup> 2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	-----	-----
4. Special milk program for fiscal year 1962 (S. 146; Public Law 87-67) (contract authority involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC).....	<sup>6</sup> 105,000,000	<sup>6</sup> 105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	-----	-----
5. Special feed grain program for 1961 (H.R. 4510; Public Law 87-5) (contract authority involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC).....	(9)	(9)	(9)	(9)	(9)	-----	-----
6. Housing Act of 1961, multiyear (S. 1922; Public Law 87-70) (public debt and contract authority):							
(a) FNMA, special assistance (public debt).....	750,000,000	750,000,000	750,000,000	<sup>7</sup> 1,550,000,000	<sup>7</sup> 1,550,000,000	+800,000,000	+800,000,000
(b) College housing loans (public debt).....	1,350,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,350,000,000	<sup>8</sup> 1,200,000,000	<sup>8</sup> 1,200,000,000	+150,000,000	+200,000,000
(c) Public facility loans (public debt).....	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	500,000,000	450,000,000	+400,000,000	+400,000,000
(1) Mass transportation loans (public debt).....	-----	-----	100,000,000	-----	50,000,000	+50,000,000	+50,000,000
(d) Urban renewal grants (contract authority).....	<sup>9</sup> 2,500,000,000	<sup>9</sup> 2,500,000,000	<sup>9</sup> 2,500,000,000	<sup>9</sup> 2,000,000,000	<sup>9</sup> 2,000,000,000	+500,000,000	+500,000,000
(e) Public housing (contract authority):							
(1) Annual contributions.....	<sup>10</sup> 3,146,000,000	<sup>10</sup> 3,146,000,000	<sup>10</sup> 3,146,000,000	<sup>10</sup> 3,146,000,000	<sup>10</sup> 3,146,000,000	-----	-----
(2) Demonstration grants.....	<sup>11</sup> (10,000,000)	<sup>11</sup> (10,000,000)	<sup>11</sup> (10,000,000)	-----	<sup>11</sup> 5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
(f) Open space land grants (contract authority).....	<sup>12</sup> (100,000,000)	<sup>12</sup> (100,000,000)	-----	<sup>12</sup> (100,000,000)	<sup>12</sup> 50,000,000	+50,000,000	+50,000,000
(g) Mass transportation demonstration grants (contract authority).....	<sup>13</sup> (10,000,000)	<sup>13</sup> (10,000,000)	<sup>13</sup> (50,000,000)	-----	<sup>13</sup> (25,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)
(h) Farm housing loans (public debt).....	<sup>14</sup> 207,000,000	<sup>14</sup> 207,000,000	<sup>14</sup> 207,000,000	<sup>14</sup> 407,000,000	<sup>14</sup> 407,000,000	+200,000,000	+200,000,000
Total, housing bill.....	8,003,000,000	7,653,000,000	<sup>15</sup> 8,103,000,000	8,803,000,000	8,858,000,000	+855,000,000	+1,205,000,000
Loans.....	(2,357,000,000)	(2,007,000,000)	(2,467,000,000)	(3,657,000,000)	(3,657,000,000)	(+1,300,000,000)	(+1,650,000,000)
Grants.....	(5,646,000,000)	(5,646,000,000)	(5,646,000,000)	(5,146,000,000)	(5,201,000,000)	(+445,000,000)	(+445,000,000)
7. Cape Cod National Seashore Park (S. 857; H.R. 6788; Public Law 87-126) (contract authority).....	<sup>16</sup> (16,000,000)	<sup>16</sup> (16,000,000)	16,000,000	<sup>16</sup> (16,000,000)	<sup>16</sup> (16,000,000)	-----	-----
8. Federal aid to airports, 5 years (H.R. 6580; S. 1703; H.R. 8102) (contract authority).....	375,000,000	375,000,000	375,000,000	<sup>16</sup> (375,000,000)	-----	-----	-----

See footnotes at end of table.



*New authority to obligate the Government carried in identified legislative bills—1st sess., 87th Cong. (public debt borrowing, contract authority, use of receipts, and authority to use existing authority)—Continued*

[Please note that for some bills no amounts are shown; thus the grand totals understate the situation]

Bill and subject	Executive requests		Senate	House	Enacted	Enacted compared with executive requests—	
	Full basis	Basis comparable to enacted				Full basis	Comparable basis
9. Mutual security loans, 5 years (H.R. 8400; S. 1983; Public Law 87-195) (public debt borrowing, use of certain repayments, and contract authority):							
(a) Public debt borrowing for development loans.....	\$7,300,000,000	\$7,300,000,000	\$7,987,000,000	(17)	<sup>18</sup> (\$7,200,000,000)	—\$7,300,000,000	—\$7,300,000,000
(b) Use of receipts from old loans for development loans.....	<sup>19</sup> 1,487,000,000	<sup>19</sup> 1,487,000,000				—1,487,000,000	—1,487,000,000
(c) Drawdown on Defense stocks and services for military assistance purposes (Defense can incur obligations in anticipation of reimbursement) (sec. 510).....	400,000,000	400,000,000	200,000,000	\$400,000,000	300,000,000	—100,000,000	—100,000,000
(d) Use for foreign currencies (House, sec. 611; Senate, sec. 612).....	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)		
Total, mutual security.....	9,187,000,000	9,187,000,000	8,187,000,000	400,000,000	300,000,000	—8,887,000,000	—8,887,000,000
10. Highway Act of 1961 (H.R. 6713; Public Law 87-61) (diversion of general fund revenues to "trust" fund; contract authority):							
(a) Diversion of ½ of 10 percent tax on trucks, buses, and trailers <sup>21</sup> .....			1,660,000,000	1,803,000,000	1,660,000,000	+1,660,000,000	+1,660,000,000
11. Agricultural Act of 1961 (H.R. 6400; H.R. 8230; S. 1983; Public Law 87-128):							
(a) 1962 wheat program (use of CCC funds involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC).....			(9)	(9)	(9)		
(b) 1962 feed grain program (contract authority and use of CCC funds involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC).....			(9)	(9)	(9)		
(c) Agricultural commodities, sales for foreign currencies (contract authority involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC).....	<sup>22</sup> 7,500,000,000	<sup>22</sup> 4,500,000,000	<sup>22</sup> 4,500,000,000	<sup>22</sup> 4,500,000,000	<sup>22</sup> 4,500,000,000	—3,000,000,000	
(d) Famine relief (contract authority involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC).....	<sup>23</sup> 1,500,000,000	<sup>23</sup> 900,000,000	<sup>23</sup> 900,000,000	<sup>23</sup> 900,000,000	<sup>23</sup> 900,000,000	—600,000,000	
Total, Agricultural Act.....	9,000,000,000	5,400,000,000	5,400,000,000	5,400,000,000	5,400,000,000	—3,600,000,000	
Grand total (as to amounts listed).....	28,670,000,000	24,720,000,000	27,196,000,000	19,561,000,000			

<sup>1</sup> Department endorsed need for some legislation, but no specific request was submitted by the administration. Bill extends over 6 years.

<sup>2</sup> Recommended usual-type authorization of appropriation to 3 revolving funds plus use of receipts derived from operations. House concurred.

<sup>3</sup> For 3 revolving funds plus use of receipts derived from operations.

<sup>4</sup> For calendar year 1961 only (to a total of \$3,500,000,000).

<sup>5</sup> Originally submitted as part of the general farm bill, to be financed in this manner for fiscal 1962 and thereafter through the more usual annual advance appropriation.

<sup>6</sup> Amounts not precisely determinable.

<sup>7</sup> Basis for this figure is set out on pp. 54-55, H. Rept. 447.

<sup>8</sup> For 4-year period; full executive request and Senate bill were for 5-year period.

<sup>9</sup> For 4-year period.

<sup>10</sup> Represents estimated maximum cost of annual contributions for 100,000 units of public housing to be paid out over period 40 to 45 years. See pp. 55-56, H. Rept. 447.

<sup>11</sup> Regular authorization for appropriation in Executive request and Senate bill. House bill made no provision. Bill changed at conference stage to contract authority.

<sup>12</sup> Regular authorization for appropriation. Senate bill made no provision. Bill changed at conference stage to contract authority.

<sup>13</sup> Part of, and included in, item 6(d), urban renewal grant authority.

<sup>14</sup> Executive request and Senate bill proposed a 5-year extension of availability of the uncommitted balance of previous authority otherwise due to expire on June 30, 1961. (Amount variously estimated at \$207,000,000 to \$285,000,000; actually turned out to be \$227,612,000.) House bill and final version extend such balance and add \$200,000,000 additional—limited, however, to a 4-year period. See pp. 57-58, H. Rept. 447.

<sup>15</sup> Excludes \$1,200,000,000 carried in Senate bill for veterans direct loans inasmuch as the program is also accounted for in the first bill listed in tabulation.

<sup>16</sup> Regular authorization for appropriation.

<sup>17</sup> Usual form of appropriation authorization—\$1,200,000,000 for fiscal 1962 only.

<sup>18</sup> Authorizes this amount to be appropriated over 5 years, 1962-66, but confers authority on the President to make agreements "committing" such appropriation authorizations, "subject only to the annual appropriation of such funds."

<sup>19</sup> Officially estimated at \$287,000,000 for 1962 and \$300,000,000 for each succeeding year.

<sup>20</sup> Precise amounts not identified.

<sup>21</sup> While technically this is not "New authority to obligate the Government," it has the same effect insofar as general budget totals and results are concerned in that it is, in final effect, the same as an expenditure from the general fund. Amounts shown taken from p. 12, S. Rept. 367. "New authority to obligate the Government" carried in the law, and requested, is \$11,560,000,000 for the interstate program over the period through 1972; but it is against the highway "trust" fund, not the general fund. Not shown here are the executive proposals (1) to increase new obligating authority for the A-B-C program; (2) to shift financing of forest and public land highways from the general fund to the "trust" fund; and (3) to redirect aviation gas tax revenues from the "trust" fund to the general fund. They are not shown because action was postponed to a later time.

<sup>22</sup> Enacted and Senate bills for 3 calendar years, 1962-64. Full executive request was 5 years, 1962-66. House was for 3 years, 1962-64, with no limit, but in order to avoid gross distortion of totals and comparisons, \$4,500,000,000 is arbitrarily inserted.

<sup>23</sup> Full executive request was for 5 calendar years, 1962-66. Senate, House, and enacted are for 3 calendar years, 1962-64.

## Nine New Plants Financed by MIBA Will Be Completed and in Operation This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE  
OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Maine is populated by an enterprising citizenry that assiduously adheres to a do-it-yourself philosophy.

In consonance with this theme of citizens and State independence, the Maine Industrial Building Authority Act of 1957

established a unique organization designed to promote industrial development in the State of Maine.

Under this act, an industrial authority was set up, such an authority being empowered to guarantee up to \$20 million in loans extended by banks and other lending institutions to local nonprofit corporations located throughout the State.

This authority, in order to meet its obligations, was authorized to issue up to \$20 million of its own bonds, and these bonds are fully supported by the full credit of the State of Maine.

Only nonprofit development corporations are entitled to borrow under this program, the maximum for any single loan being \$1 million. Under the program's operation local development cor-

porations rent building facilities to existing and new industries on a lease or lease-purchase basis. New structures are built only at such times as clients give adequate assurance of active interest.

The act provides that the local agencies must have a minimum of 10-percent equity in any undertaking; hence, participating banks could lend as much as 90 percent of the valuation. Furthermore, the act permits that such loans may be made for periods up to 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, I have a particular interest in the functions of this authority, for prior to 1958 the Federal Reserve Act prohibited national banks from making loans in excess of 66⅔ percent of valuation. This had the effect of preventing national banks in the State of

Maine from participating in full accord with the 90-percent-of-valuation loan provision of the Maine Industrial Building Authority Act.

Through legislation introduced by me and other interested Congressmen, this restriction was lifted through an amendment to the Small Business Act of 1958, which permitted 90-percent-of-valuation loans to be made by national banks in those instances where the bonds of a lending authority were supported by the full credit of a State. Through such an amendment the financial resources of national banks in Maine became sufficiently available to implement the provisions of the Maine Industrial Building Authority Act.

That this State-advanced effort is bearing fruit is borne out by the results, and in this respect I would like to insert into the RECORD an article from the

August 31 issue of the Houlton Pioneer Times that gives some insight into the economic dynamics generated by this State-sponsored authority:

[From the Houlton Pioneer Times,  
Aug. 31, 1961]

**NINE NEW PLANTS FINANCED BY MIBA WILL BE COMPLETED AND IN OPERATION THIS YEAR**  
(By Roderic C. O'Connor, manager, Maine Industrial Building Authority)

Nine new industrial plants, financed with the assistance of the Maine Industrial Building Authority, will be completed and start operations this year.

These plants will provide jobs for 1,300 employees and provide a total payroll of more than \$4 million. The plants will have a total floor area of about 500,000 square feet.

Total cost of the nine plants is over \$5 million; insured mortgage loans involve \$4.25 million, with \$3 million of such loans made by private Maine lending institutions.

The nine new plants, their location, cost, footage, and products are:

Tenant firm	Location	Project cost	Square footage	Product
Morningstar-Paisley, Inc.	Houlton	\$1,100,000	60,000	Potato starch modifications.
Hamilton & Sons, Inc.	Auburn	33,000	5,000	Metal fabrications.
Northeast Gases, Inc.	Saco	80,000	8,000	Industrial gases.
Potato Service, Inc.	Presque Isle	1,250,000	120,000	Processed potatoes.
Hancock-Ellsworth Tanners, Inc.	Hancock	800,000	70,000	Sheepskin leather.
R. & L. Manufacturing Co., Inc.	Waterboro	160,000	23,000	Trophies.
Vahlsing, Inc., Maine	Easton	1,150,000	95,000	Processed potatoes.
Casco Printing Co.	Portland	130,000	15,000	Job printing.
Lynn Innersole Co., Inc.	Saco	65,000	98,000	Shoe innersoles.

## Strengthening the Two-Party System

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. KEN HECHLER**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, a strong two-party system is one of the bulwarks of our democracy. Believing as I do that we must all take advantage of any opportunity afforded to strengthen the two-party system, a few days ago I addressed the following letter to the Honorable Cecil H. Underwood, former Governor of the State of West Virginia:

SEPTEMBER 7, 1961.

HON. CECIL H. UNDERWOOD,  
Huntington, W. Va.

DEAR CECIL: I hope you will run against me for Congress in 1962.

It seems to me that in the interests of the two-party system the Republican Party should run its strongest candidate. As a former Governor of West Virginia and temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention in 1960, you are far and away the strongest possible candidate.

There are three reasons which may have kept you from wanting to run for Congress: (1) the responsibilities of your present position as a coal executive; (2) a dislike for the 2-year term; (3) a feeling that the three new counties added to the Fourth Congressional District make Republican success difficult.

Let me analyze each of these. (1) You have made a great contribution to the development of the coal industry in your present position. But no man should refuse a call to the higher duty of public office, where your talents would be available on a far broader scale in the interests of the State we love.

(2) A campaign every 2 years is admittedly difficult. Yet if you should win in 1962, this would be an excellent stepping stone for another statewide race in 1964 for a longer term as Governor or Senator. Meanwhile, by defeating me in 1962, you would not only win the congressional seat for the Republicans, but also make the task easier for the Republican Party in the 1964 congressional race—even if you decided in 1964 to leave Congress in order to run for the Senate or the governorship.

(3) Despite the new counties added, the Fourth Congressional District is still a swing district where the vote will be very close. In case you are concerned by the Democratic registration majority, perhaps the following figures on your 1960 Senate race within the counties of the new Fourth Congressional District are very revealing:

#### 1960 U.S. Senate race

County	Underwood majority	Randolph majority
Cabell	3,454	
Jackson	1,362	
Lincoln		825
Logan		7,921
Mason	978	
Pleasants	5	
Putnam		406
Ritchie	2,044	
Roane	889	
Tyler	2,001	
Wayne		2,018
Wirt	16	
Wood	3,327	

As you can see, you carried 9 out of the 13 counties in the new Fourth Congressional District. Your total vote in these 13 counties was 96,372 to 93,466 for Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH—a majority of 2,906 against a superb campaigner and a peerless orator. If you could get close to a 3,000 majority over a powerful candidate like Senator RANDOLPH, you should not be afraid of me.

I think if you ran against me we would help to bring the issues forcefully to the attention of the voters, and thereby

strengthen the forces of democracy. Such a campaign would stimulate greater interest in government by the people. Whatever the result, the people of West Virginia would gain through wider participation as we both worked constructively for the interests of our State.

You owe it to the Republican Party to make this fight. Even more, you owe it to the State of West Virginia. I hope you will decide to make the race.

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

## Take the Guesswork Out of Air Crashes

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week 78 persons were killed when a commercial airliner crashed just a few minutes after taking off from Chicago's Midway Airport. This was the worst plane crash in Chicago's history.

During this past weekend another airplane crashed shortly after taking off from Shannon, Ireland, killing another 80 people.

Two of Chicago's outstanding newspapers, the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Tribune, have spoken out in support of legislation which I have introduced which would require all commercial airliners to carry a recording device in a shock-proof, heat-proof container installed in the cabin of the aircraft with an open microphone constantly recording all conversations in the cockpit of the aircraft.

I introduced this legislation more than 2 years ago with the sincere hope that we would be able to eliminate a good part of the agonizing speculation which follows every major air disaster by having a record of the pilot's efforts to save his plane during the last tragic moments before a crash. I am convinced this information from the pilot would provide vital information to establish the cause of a disaster.

The Federal Aviation Agency has advised Congress that it already has the authority to order installation of such recording devices.

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, Najeeb Halaby, told a press conference in Chicago last week there are technical problems involved in the installation of such devices. I have the highest degree of confidence in Mr. Halaby and am sure that if he will order an urgent program for the development of this equipment, such equipment can be perfected very quickly. I hope there will be no further delay in ordering these recorders installed in commercial airliners.

These recorders in themselves could not have avoided the two most recent crashes, but certainly had they been ordered installed at the time I introduced the original legislation, we would be in a much better position today to evaluate the causes of these crashes and take ap-



appropriate action to prevent similar tragedies in the future.

It is inconceivable to me that there would be any further delay in the installation of this equipment. The Airline Pilots Association favors such an order; in my discussions with operators of commercial airlines I have found no one who has raised any serious objections; and the Federal Aviation Agency itself has been working on this project for more than 2 years now.

I am confident that with all the technological gains we have made in practically every field of human endeavor, we should have no problem perfecting a device that will do this job effectively and will at least give us a better idea of what is the cause of these crashes.

I hope the FAA Administrator will order the installation of these devices forthwith; and in support of my contention, I include in the RECORD today two excellent editorials. The first appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on September 2; the second appeared in the Chicago Tribune on September 9.

I hope there will be no further delay in carrying out this project.

The articles follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 9, 1961]

#### THE MISSING CLUE

Unofficial reports from the men investigating last week's airplane disaster seem to confirm the belief that there was a structural failure and that part of the tail assembly, including a rudder, broke away just before the plane crashed. This would explain why this section was found, relatively undamaged, about a quarter of a mile to the rear of where the rest of the plane first hit the ground.

Weakening of the tail assembly, it is theorized, would have interfered with and perhaps destroyed the pilot's control of the plane. This might explain the sharp right turn which the plane made just before crashing. The captain may have called on the copilot for help, thus explaining why no radio call was made. Then, as part of the tail broke off, the rest of the plane would have been thrown into an uncontrollable dive.

If the investigators could be sure that this was what happened, they could promptly rule out other theories and concentrate on why the metal gave way. They would be done with their job sooner, their conclusions would probably carry more conviction than otherwise, and their recommendations would be that much more likely to prevent a recurrence. It would help them immeasurably to know what was said in the cockpit just before the crash.

The same could be said of previous crashes in which, for one reason or another, no hint of trouble was given by radio.

Nearly 2 years ago, after an earlier and inadequately explained crash, we suggested that a tape recorder might provide much necessary information. Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, of Chicago, has asked Congress to require airlines to install one in the cockpit, where it would run constantly while the plane is in flight.

The record need only cover a few minutes; older sounds and voices could be automatically erased as later ones are recorded. The tape would have to be in a shockproof and fireproof container, but the evidence it provided would save time and uncertainty during investigations and would very likely save lives. It should be worth the relatively insignificant cost of the equipment.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 2, 1961]

#### CHICAGO'S WORST AIR DISASTER

The worst plane crash in Chicago's history, and the worst in U.S. commercial aviation involving a single plane, killed 78 persons early yesterday only minutes after takeoff from Midway Airport. Especially poignant, entire families on gay vacations with their children were among the victims.

With the rest of the community, we join in mourning the losses which have been suffered by so many loved ones and friends of those aboard the craft.

At this writing, the cause of the disaster is not known. A passenger on an earlier leg of the cross-country flight, who disembarked at Chicago, has told of hearing a strange noise and feeling unusual vibration during the flight here. The FBI is investigating the possibility that a bomb was responsible. Witnesses said they saw a "blinding flash" as the plane circled before falling.

A regular procedure is to reconstruct the plane from the wreckage in an effort to determine what structural failure or operational difficulty was responsible for the tragedy. This is a long-drawn process and offers no certain prospect that the cause of the crash will ever be found.

U.S. Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, has proposed that all planes be equipped with automatic tape recording devices, in crashproof, sealed containers, that would preserve the last 5 minutes of a pilot's and a copilot's conversation. It would continually erase earlier conversation.

Thus, after a crash, investigators would have the testimony of the nature of the trouble from the best possible source, the men flying the plane. Plane-to-ground radio does not assure any such message. Contact can be lost in a storm, or the radio can be destroyed in a fire.

Such recording devices exist and the Federal Aviation Agency has authority to install them. We understand that an order for them to be put in use was to have been issued earlier this year but got sidetracked. There should be no further delay on this.

With airliners steadily increasing in size and passenger capacity, everything possible should be done to prevent disasters such as yesterday's. Determining the cause of crashes is part of prevention. The tape idea should at least be tried.

#### A Long History of Service

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the motion picture industry's long history of outstanding service to the Nation in time of need is a familiar story to all of us. But perhaps less known to many is the fact that each year Hollywood contributes over a million dollars to national and local charities through a unique fund-raising organization known as Motion Picture Permanent Charities.

This year, Motion Picture Permanent Charities will conduct its 20th anniversary campaign throughout the film and allied industries with a goal of raising \$1,250,000 for the 22 major health and welfare agencies it supports.

Notable in this 20th anniversary year is the fact that some time during the

campaign, the Motion Picture Permanent Charities will reach a total of \$25 million raised to help worthwhile charitable organizations. This, I think, is a truly remarkable achievement for a single industry to accomplish. But the record for outstanding achievements by Motion Picture Permanent Charities is equally remarkable.

It was formed in 1940 as a clearinghouse to screen and approve agencies appealing to the film industry for funds, but by 1942 it became evident to its leaders that a different kind of fund-raising organization was needed by the film industry.

Thus, late in 1942 Motion Picture Permanent Charities, under Samuel Goldwyn's leadership, created its own campaign organization and consolidated all charity appeals within the film industry, the first such comprehensive program undertaken by a single American industry.

Following this pioneering venture, Motion Picture Permanent Charities set another first in the charity field by instituting the fair plan, payroll deduction system by which an employee contributes voluntarily a fixed amount from each paycheck. So successful was this system that other industries and other charity federations have modeled their fund-raising programs after the fair plan.

Undoubtedly Motion Picture Permanent Charities will pioneer other programs in the future, but on this 20th anniversary I think it appropriate to extend to Hollywood and the Motion Picture Permanent Charities the applause and thanks quite properly due them.

#### Washington Report

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of September 9, 1961.

#### WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

SEPTEMBER 9, 1961.

As predicted in my newsletter of August 19 a greatly amended foreign aid authorization bill was sent back to the House from conference and was approved on August 31, 260 to 132. The final bill authorized appropriations of \$4,253,500,000 for foreign economic and military aid in fiscal 1962 and \$1.5 billion in each of the following 4 years for Development Loan Fund long-term, low interest development loans. The bill also authorized the President to establish a new foreign aid agency. The final bill did not include the long-term borrowing authority requested by the President. He had asked for authority to borrow \$8.8 billion from the Treasury for the Development Loan Fund over a 5-year period fiscal 1962-66 to finance long-term, low interest development loans. The final bill authorized \$1.2 billion for fiscal 1962 and \$1.5 billion a year for fiscal

1963-66, making \$7.2 billion available for development loans over the 5 years but required annual appropriation of funds (at least a partial victory for those of us in the House who fought the transfer of responsibility for appropriations from Congress to the Executive).

The foreign aid appropriation bill was whipped through the House in 1 day, September 5, by a record vote, 270-123. The bill as approved appropriated \$3,357,500,000 for foreign aid, \$896 million less than carried in the authorization bill, but \$300 million more than recommended by the House Appropriations Committee.

One of my principal objections to foreign aid is the money we give to our enemies and so-called neutral nations. This objection was supported during the debate on the foreign aid bill by Congressman GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California, who pointed out that the dollars of U.S. taxpayers are being sent to Cuba to bolster the Communist regime of Fidel Castro. Congressman LIPSCOMB, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, pointed to the report on the Foreign Aid Appropriations Bill. He said each year the President requests millions of dollars to cover U.S. contributions to international organizations. In just one instance, LIPSCOMB pointed out, the Pan American Health Organization is providing 32 Russian jeeps for a malaria eradication program in Cuba. Although malaria has a low incidence rate there, the eradication allotment in 1961 is \$79,766, or 20 times the amount budgeted in 1958—before Fidel Castro came to power. This has been augmented by a \$99,000 allotment from the World Health Organization Malaria Eradication Special Account, for the purpose of providing the Soviet jeeps to Cuba. The American taxpayer pays 66 percent of the cost of the so-called health plan for Cuba instigated by PAHO.

#### UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND

LIPSCOMB reminded Congress that this Fund, to which the United States contributes 40 percent, on May 24 granted \$1,157,600 to aid agricultural research programs in Cuba. U.S. contributions for the fiscal year 1961, both assessed and voluntary, amounted to \$241,799,522 to over 50 international organizations and their related activities. According to Congressman LIPSCOMB, it appears that very few, if anyone, have ever attempted to figure out where this money actually goes, and actually what it is used for.

Add to these startling statements of how the U.S. taxpayer is contributing to countries dedicated to our destruction, the utter contempt for the United States and our ideals expressed by the delegates to the Conference of Uncommitted Nations at Belgrade last week, and the course we are taking to our own national suicide (newsletter of Aug. 26) becomes more apparent. The nations present at the Belgrade Conference have been the recipients of \$7.2 billion from the American taxpayers. Yet not one voice was raised in behalf of American policies. Not a single delegate protested a vicious attack on the United States by the Communist delegate from Cuba. On the other hand, no official action was taken by the Conference to condemn the Soviet Union for its wanton disregard of humanity for its devious use of 3 years of useless negotiations on banning nuclear testing to build up its own arsenal and then arrogantly begin testing within hours of an announcement that it would. No protests from the uncommitted nations for the enslavement of 17 million human beings in East Germany. While India's Nehru piously asks the United States to negotiate with the Communists on issues which are not negotiable, he utters not a word of protest at the brutal and barbaric invasion of Tibet and the inhuman atrocities

practiced on her people by the Communists.

It's time we faced facts. The uncommitted nations are not uncommitted, nor are they neutral. For whatever reason, fear or self-interest, they are aligned with Soviet Russia and when the chips are down, in the final contest between freedom and Communist slavery, they will be against us unless they are convinced that we are stronger and will win the battle. There are no moral grounds for neutralism in a fight to the death. Those countries which give aid and comfort to our enemy also become our enemies. My own position is opposed to foreign aid until it is used in the self-interest of the United States.

### Myers Bros.: Diamond Jubilee

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, this year Myers Bros. Department Store of Springfield, Ill., is celebrating its diamond jubilee. This store is as much a part of that city as the historic Lincoln shrines. In a sense it is a Lincoln shrine, as the present store is located on the site once occupied by a law office of Abraham Lincoln.

This occasion commemorates more than just 75 years in the retail business. It marks the consistent policy of the Myers Bros. to follow fundamental rules of responsibility of business in a country of free enterprise.

The combination of energetic work, business ingenuity, forward thinking, and a tradition of providing top quality merchandise at the lowest possible price are the major ingredients of success in this "store that quality built." Coupled with this strictly business attitude, however, is the family's pride in their hometown. "Civic duty is the rent we pay for the space we occupy in our community" has been the motto of the Myers brothers since the founding of their business in 1886.

There is quite a contrast between the first and present stores. Myers Bros. in the beginning was a two-story building, 22 feet wide, located on the west side of Lincoln Square and the Sangamon County Courthouse. Albert and Louis Myers, later joined by their younger brother Julius, purchased the business in 1886 from Sam Rosenwald, whose faith in these young men was so profound that he personally chose them as the new owners and lent them money for the purchase of the store. Rosenwald was the father of Julius Rosenwald, who later became famous through his association with Sears, Roebuck & Co., and as a great philanthropist.

Albert and Louis started out with one clerk and credit to buy merchandise. But through economical management, they had cleared their indebtedness and were making a profit from their venture before the first year was out.

By 1900 the store had expanded from the potbellied stove and kerosene lamp atmosphere, and the business was moved into a brandnew five-storied building on the corner of Fifth and Washington Streets.

In 1924, disaster struck, and the store was burned to the ground. Undaunted by this setback, the Myers brothers bought out a store down the street—lock, stock, and barrel—and were back in business the next day, making plans for their present 10-story home. Without a halt in operation or inconvenience to their customers, Myers Bros. were back with an expanded business in only 1 year.

This example is typical of how the Myers brothers weathered other rough times—wars, depressions, boomlets and booms. But as times and methods change, the Myers brothers family proved not only adaptable to such change, but succeeded in accumulating a record of leadership in both local and national business affairs.

Locally, Myers Bros. collected a string of "firsts." Their store was the first Springfield business ever honored with front-page recognition in the Wall Street Journal; the first to use color advertising, first to hold a live flower show in connection with spring openings, first to publish an extensive Sunday rotogravure section, first to carry a non-contributory pension plan for their employees, and first with store-home deliveries for their customers.

Countrywide recognition came when Julius Myers, now deceased, became the first president of the National Retail Merchants Association. Myers Bros. are also recipients of the sixth annual retail award plaque, 1954, citing them as brand name retailer of the year.

Thus, what began as a small store in a pioneer town has now blossomed into an established business with six branch stores throughout central Illinois, servicing Jacksonville, Danville, Lincoln, Mattoon, Havana, and Alton.

Myers Bros. have come the long way from a one-clerk operation to a payroll of 250 persons. Their average employee has 6 years' service, and many have 25 years or more. The store now has 67 selling departments, and 14 service departments, all coordinated and timed in buying and selling procedures to keep up with and anticipate current trends in the market.

The brothers themselves have contributed three generations of service to their business and their community. There is virtually no major civic group that has not felt the personal help and leadership of one or more of the Myers brothers. From the founders to the present managers, Stanley C., Albert M., Alan J., James E., Morris, and Louis, the Illinois State capital and subsequently other communities have benefited by their devotion as active citizens.

Whether it is a Boy Scout, junior college, YMCA, hospital or civic club drive, one of the Myers family can always be found in assistance. To these men, such work is merely in keeping with their philosophy that "a growing and progres-



sive community and a growing and progressive business are one and the same."

Thus, credit to Myers Bros. is not just a passing recognition of a successful business, which it is; but also the recognition of a sincere application of principles and integrity, in the quest for a better future. Myers Bros. are evidence of the fact that a strong community is based on the permanence of economic enterprise and faithful citizenship.

In closing I would like to note that the founders of this fine and upstanding business were close friends of my father, Peter F. Mack, Sr., and I am proud to say that the present owners are good friends of mine.

## Progress Report on Rural Areas Redevelopment

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, September 11, 1961*

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, the progress of the rural counties of the United States is just as vital, if not more vital in many ways, to the continued progress and prosperity of this country as our great cities. The establishment of the Area Redevelopment Agency in the U.S. Department of Commerce has been a good step in the right direction toward the relief of those cities hard hit by the recession which this country experienced the past year. I have long been interested in the plight of some of our more rural communities, and am pleased to be able to insert in the RECORD at this time the following statement provided me by the U.S. Department of Agriculture telling of that Department's activities in the rural areas of the country. This is just another sign of the tremendous interest of the Kennedy administration in all our peoples, be they in cities or the rural areas. Under unanimous consent, I include this information in the RECORD:

#### PROGRESS REPORT ON RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

The Department of Agriculture has launched a full-scale campaign to end rural poverty by aggressively promoting more jobs and other opportunities in the Nation's rural counties.

Since January 20 the Department has moved rapidly to mobilize its resources and personnel for a total program of rural areas development, which Secretary Freeman terms "more important to the long-range future of our Nation than any other program now being conducted by the Department."

In the short space of 7 months the new RAD program has gone into operation throughout the Nation, reinforced by new and strengthened services of the Department. Some highlights of the remarkable progress that's been made:

Establishment of a top level Department of Agriculture RAD Board and staff to get the program into operation.

Organization of State and local RAD activities, with Farmers Home Administration,

Rural Electrification Administration, and Federal Extension Service assigned the full-time job of helping local groups get underway.

Naming of 487 rural counties as eligible for financial aid under the new Area Redevelopment Act, and direct USDA assistance to leaders in making use of ARA to strengthen their economies.

Stepped up rural electrification, farm credit, and small watershed work of the Department to make even greater resources available for rural development. Of particular importance is more imaginative use of REA section 5 loans to finance machinery in rural industries.

The task of rural areas development is national in scope, international in gravity. Today in the United States more than 36 percent of all farm families have incomes of less than \$2,000 a year. Last year, if underemployment in the Nation's farm regions were converted into terms of unemployment, there would have been 1.4 million persons in rural America unemployed.

RAD aims at more rapid economic growth in farm communities and small towns where these underemployed families live. This is a key factor in winning the cold war. The United States must prove to noncommitted peoples of the world, most of whom live in rural sections, that rural poverty and suffering can be eliminated at home. Otherwise they will turn to other governmental systems for an answer to their problems.

For both domestic and international reasons, therefore, Secretary Freeman has placed RAD at the top of his priority list of USDA objectives. In March 1961, as a first step, he established the Rural Areas Development Board representing 12 USDA agencies. In June he set up an Office of Rural Areas Development to staff and coordinate the program. At that time, the Secretary also assigned specific jobs to three key USDA agencies, with the aim of getting work started at the grassroots as soon as possible.

Farmers Home Administration is responsible for establishing RAD panels to supply State and local leaders with technical aid in promoting new enterprises.

Federal Extension Service is responsible for providing organizational and educational leadership to State and local RAD committees. These include civic leaders, farm and business representatives, rural electric borrowers, State development agencies, trade union representatives, and all other interested groups.

Rural Electrification Administration has the job of stimulating new business and other enterprises to build employment in rural areas.

Drawing on a broad background of work with farm and other rural people, each of these key USDA agencies has rapidly geared up for its RAD assignments.

Farmers Home Administration set up a special staff to handle RAD work, and is now holding a series of training meetings with key field personnel. REA also has a new staff of some 15 specialists who are helping communities develop new rural enterprises. Rural electric and telephone co-ops are enthusiastically joining in local RAD programs. For many rural electric co-ops, rural development is tied in closely with their future operations. And in July Federal and State extension officials mobilized additional resources at National, State and county levels to support the program and conducted a series of regional meetings to intensify staff contributions for the program.

Other USDA agencies represented on the Department's RAD Board have also acted to strengthen and step up those programs that promote area development.

This rapid action on the part of the Department of Agriculture has resulted in RAD

program organizations in 38 States, with local program districts of two or more rural counties already organized in 25 States.

The Department of Agriculture also has the job of helping eligible rural counties obtain benefits under the new Area Redevelopment Act. These benefits include Federal loans and grants for public works and industrial development, technical aid, and retraining of workers, including farmers and farmworkers.

Among the Department's major assignments under the act are selecting rural counties to receive assistance; reviewing area plans for development; and most important, helping local leaders put together plans and projects that will take full advantage of the new ARA program.

Because of the Department's already existing organization for Rural Areas Development, rapid progress has been made in selecting rural counties for the ARA programs, formulating area-wide plans, and setting up local groups capable of running the program in the rural (5b) areas.

Nearly a third of the Nation's counties are covered by areas now eligible to apply for the ARA program, including 487 rural counties in 41 States and Puerto Rico. Long-range economic development plans for revitalizing their economies already have been approved for 180 counties in 22 States. The majority of these are rural redevelopment counties, assisted by the Department of Agriculture, or other similar areas with large numbers of underemployed people living in farm areas.

AREA is another tool the Department of Agriculture is using to promote maximum economic development in farming areas, along with its own extremely important kit of area development services and aids.

Many of these regular programs of the Department which implement and further local area development plans have been stepped up in this revitalized Rural Areas Development campaign against rural poverty.

Since early 1961, REA has approved 144 electrification loans amounting to \$166,781,000 and 125 telephone loans totaling \$42,594,000. Loans for generating and transmission facilities amounted to 57.6 percent of the electric total, and included a \$60 million loan, largest in REA's 26-year history, to Hoosier Cooperative Energy, Inc., of Indiana.

On September 8, REA approved a \$25,000 loan to a rural electric cooperative which will enable a small North Dakota firm to add equipment and create new jobs in a farming area. It was made under the consumer financing provision (sec. 5) of the Rural Electrification Act. REA policy on loans to help consumers acquire electrical equipment has been expanded to gear this lending program to the needs of rural areas for increased nonfarm income.

Between January 1 and August 1, 1961, 55 small watershed projects including 4.5 million acres were authorized to receive planning assistance, and 36 projects including 1.6 million acres were authorized for operations. On August 1, 325 projects including 18.6 million acres had been authorized for operations.

Between May 19 and August 14 President Kennedy sent to the Congress for approval work plans for 54 watershed projects including 3.9 million acres, the largest number sent to the Congress in a 90-day period since the program was authorized in 1954.

The Farmers Home Administration had a sharp rise in lending activity during the past 7 months and ended the 1961 fiscal year lending \$397 million, an alltime high.

Recent legislation is now being implemented which will make a more adequately financed, broadened, and expanded credit program available to a wider range of farmers, particularly young farmers just

getting started and farm families on the smaller farms.

Under the Housing Act of 1961 rural residents including those living in small communities are now eligible along with farmers for more than \$430 million rural housing loan funds available over the next 4 years to construct, improve, or repair homes and related facilities.

Secretary Freeman has called the achievement of full prosperity in America's rural areas a key factor in the world contest with communism.

"I believe that in the rural areas development program we have the weapon to wipe away the chronic depression which now enchains many areas, it can lift the curse of underemployment which saps the strength

of our rural economy in every area and it takes the first step toward the permanent prosperity of the rural community.

"This program, combined with the freedom of economic choice which the Kennedy farm legislation will provide the farmer, will help restore full freedom of economic opportunity to those who live in rural America," the Secretary said.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1961

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thou God of grace and glory, whose clearest and most searching words are heard in the silences of the soul, give, we beseech Thee, to Thy servants who here wrestle with the Nation's problems, quiet hearts and open minds that welcome all truths from whatever direction it may come. May the fret and fever of their spirits not add to the confusion of a bewildered age instead of helping and healing.

Lift our eyes, we pray Thee, above the foggy valley of narrow loyalties and partisan interests to vaster vistas where small things are seen as small, and great things as great. Remove far from us even unrecognized bigotries and prejudices based on a lack of understanding. In the crises of our time join us with those who across the waste and wilderness of human hate and need, preparing the way of the Lord, throw up a highway for our God. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1961.  
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARTLETT thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 11, 1961, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,  
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages

from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2838. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Army Distaff Foundation; and

H.R. 9080. An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore, & Washington Railroad Co., to construct, maintain, and operate branch sidings over First Street SW., in the District of Columbia.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1653) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit travel or transportation in commerce in aid of racketeering enterprises, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 2838. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Army Distaff Foundation; and

H.R. 9080. An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate branch sidings over First Street SW., in the District of Columbia.

### LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KUCHEL, and by unanimous consent, the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. McNAMARA, and by unanimous consent, the Irrigation and

Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION FOR WEDNESDAY AND FRIDAY

Upon request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow, September 13, 1961, and Friday, September 15, 1961, to take testimony on the bill (S. 1522) from the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff and the Honorable Lee Loevinger.

### RESTITUTION FOR SENECA—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for some time I have been carrying on a fight to win fair treatment for the Seneca Indians in western New York in connection with the proposed construction of the Kinzua Dam project.

I have said, and I say again, that this country, particularly at this hour in our history when we are prepared to accept the risk of armed conflict rather than yield our treaty rights in Berlin, should not take lightly the obligations of a solemn treaty with the American Indians.

However, I realize that we have reached a late hour in this controversy. Plans for construction of the dam are going ahead.

If the Indian lands are flooded, as is now planned, that does not end the story so far as I am concerned. We still have the duty to make all possible restitution to the Senecas.

Such restitution must be not only economic but also moral. In this connection I call the attention of the Senate to a wise and generous and honorable act of the Board of Supervisors of Cattaraugus County, N.Y. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed a resolution by the Cattaraugus County Board of Supervisors, suggesting that the bridge to be built across the Allegheny River as part of the dam project be designated the Seneca Memorial Bridge.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION 250

Whereas the plans for the construction of the Kinzua Dam project include the erection of a new bridge across the Allegheny River in the vicinity of Coldspring; and

Whereas the Kinzua Dam project has worked an extreme hardship upon the Seneca Nation of Indians in depriving them of lands where, for many generations, their